



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/571,650	12/13/95	YASUDA	H 7217/48794

LM61/0430
HAY H MAIOLI
COOPER & DUNHAM
1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK NY 10036

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2744

DATE MAILED: 04/30/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
08/571,650

Applicant(s)
Yasuda et al.

Examiner
Keith Ferguson

Group Art Unit
2744



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 9, 1998

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ahlberg et al.

The claimed invention reads on Ahlberg et al. as follows:

Ahlberg et al. discloses a system and method for selectively accepting telephone calls from a remote caller without establishing voice communications comprising a ring signal generator (fig. 2 number 41), a controller (control means) (fig. 2 number 45), a keypad is depressed (determining whether a predetermined operation is operated when a alert sound is rung (fig. 2 numbers 50,62, and 48 and column 6 lines 49-69 and column 10 lines 1-8), whereby an operation state of the ring signal generator is altered (column 6 lines 35-51), and by activating the hold selection means the communication state between the terminal and the remote caller remains unchanged (column 6 lines 49-51).

Regarding claim 11, Ahlberg et al. discloses a display (fig. 2 number 68).

Art Unit: 2744

Regarding claim 12, Ahlberg et al. discloses a transceiver (RF signal processing means) and an antenna (fig. 2 number 32 and 74).

Regarding claim 13, Ahlberg et al. discloses waiting to receive a call (column 10 lines 20-25), ring an alert sound upon receiving a call (column 10 lines 20-25), and changing the state of the alert sound when a predetermined operation is operated (column 10 lines 25-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 2-5,14,15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al.

Art Unit: 2744

Regarding claims 2 and 18, Ahlberg et al. discloses a system and method for selectively accepting telephone calls without establishing voice communications as discussed supra. Ahlberg et al. differs from claims 2 and 18 of the present invention in that it does not disclose the control means controls the state of said alert sound generator to stop the alert sound. However, Ahlberg et al. discloses the controller for controlling the operations of the cellular telephone (column 6 lines 27-28). The user of the telephone can accept the telephone call without establishing voice communication with the source telephone by activating the hold selection means (stop the alert sound by placing the call on hold) (column 6 lines 49-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a control means for controlling the state of the alert sound generator in order to communicate with a caller when its convenience.

Regarding claims 3 and 19, Ahlberg et al. differs from claims 3 and 19 of the present invention in that it does not disclose the control means controls the state of said alert sound generator to reduce the volume of the alert sound. However, control means that controls the state of an alert sound generator to reduce the volume of the alert sound are well known in the art such as in telephones where there are ringer controls to control the ringer volume if it's too loud or too low. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a control means that controls the state of the alert sound generator to reduce the volume of the alert sound in order not to disturb other people who are working together.

Art Unit: 2744

Regarding claim 4,5 and 15, Ahlberg et al. differs from claims 4,5 and 15 of the present invention in that it does not disclose a power key. However, power keys are well known in the art such as in telephones keypads in order to operate a telephone by pressing an on/off switch. When a caller is trying to call a cellular telephone the operator of the cellular telephone would depress a power key which places the call off hook canceling a ringing signal. Nazanin et al. discloses an power key in a keypad (column 2 lines 1-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a power key in order to turn a telephone on or off.

Regarding claim 14, Ahlberg et al. differs from claim 14 of the present invention in that it does not disclose depressing a predetermined key for a time shorter than a predetermined period of time. However, Ahlberg et al. discloses activating the hold selecting means (depressing a key for a predetermined mount of time) (column 6 lines 48-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to depress a predetermined key for a time shorter than a predetermined period of time in order to place the caller on hold.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. in view of Higuchi et al.

Ahlberg et al. discloses a system and method for selectively accepting telephone calls without establishing voice communications as discussed supra in claims 1-15. Ahlberg et al. differs from claim 16 of the present invention in that it does not disclose a predetermined period

Art Unit: 2744

of time is substantially equal to one second. Higuchi et al. discloses an user may answer a call by pressing a send key (predetermined period of time is substantially equal to one second)(column 8 lines 69 and column 9 line 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Ahlberg et al. with a predetermined period of time is substantially equal to one second in order to answer a incoming call which discontinue a telephones ringing, as suggested by Higuchi et al.

6. Claims 6-10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. in view of Roeder and Knuth et al.

Regarding claims 6-10, Ahlberg et al. discloses a system and method for selectively accepting telephone calls without establishing voice communications as discussed supra in claims 1-5. Ahlberg et al. differs from claims 6-10 of the present invention in that it does not disclose a power source, wherein the control means breaks off power when the power key is depressed for at least a predetermined period of time and the control means changes the state of the alert generator when said power key is depressed shorter than the predetermined period of time. However, telephones comprising a control means, multifunction keys and a power source is well known in the art such as a power key used to power on/off a telephone by pressing a key (substantially equal to one second) which eliminates a ringing signal of an incoming call. Roeder discloses a dual mode keypad permitting one touch dialing (a key is depressed shorter than the predetermined period of time)(title and abstract). Knuth et al. teaches an one touch control telephone answering device that can perform multiple functions all by activating a single button

Art Unit: 2744

(changes the state of the alert generator)(column 1 lines 28-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Ahlberg et al. with a power source, wherein the control means breaks off power when the power key is depressed for at least a predetermined period of time and the control means changes the state of the alert generator when said power key is depressed shorter than the predetermined period of time in order to provide one touch activation such as turning off a telephone ringing signal by pressing a single key without eliminating the regular function of a standard keypad, as suggested by Roeder and Knuth et al.

Regarding claims 17, Ahlberg et al. discloses a system and method for selectively accepting telephone calls without establishing voice communications as discussed supra in claim 13. Ahlberg et al. differs from claim 17 of the present invention in that it does not disclose a step of changing the state of the alert sound includes the step of toggling the predetermined operation. However, the teaching of toggling a telephone key in a telephone keypad is well known in the art such as a dual mode keypad permitting one touch dialing as taught in Roeder (U.S. Patent 5,491,745)(title and abstract). Knuth et al. (U. S. Patent 5,406,618) teaches an one touch control telephone answering device that can perform multiple functions all by activating a single button (column 1 lines 28-36). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Ahlberg et al. with a step of changing the state of the alert sound includes the step of toggling the predetermined operation to provide multifunction operation of a single key as taught by Roeder and Knuth et al.

Art Unit: 2744

Response to Amendment

7. Applicant's arguments filed 3/9/98 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. The following are explanations to the applicant arguments:

8. Argument: Applicant alleges that Ahlberg et al. does not allow the user to avoid the call from the caller while at the same time silencing the ringer.

Explanation: Examiner respectfully disagrees because Ahlberg et al. teaches by activating the hold selecting means the user of the cellular telephone can transfer to another party, send a reply from a voice mail or answer machine, or simply ignore (avoid) the request for communication while silencing the ringer (column 10 lines 1-8).

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL

Art Unit: 2744

AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

10. **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE")

Or:

(703) 308-5403, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2021 Crystal
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Serial Number: 08/571,650

Page 10

Art Unit: 2744


examiner should be directed to Examiner Keith Ferguson whose telephone number is (703)305-4888.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Keith Ferguson, Examiner *WK*

Art Unit 2744

April 15, 1998


DWAYNE D. BOST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700